UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/543,127	04/24/2006	Conny Hagg	1506-1085	2623	
466 YOUNG & TH	7590 09/15/200 OMPSON	EXAMINER			
209 Madison St		KURTZ, BENJAMIN M			
Suite 500 ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
				1797	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			09/15/2008	PAPER	

## Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
	10/543,127	HAGG, CONNY			
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
	BENJAMIN KURTZ	1797			
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address			
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w.  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tim vill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE	lely filed the mailing date of this communication. (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status					
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>24 Ar</u>	action is non-final. nce except for formal matters, pro				
Disposition of Claims					
4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-12 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrav 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) 1-12 is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or Application Papers 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examine 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on 22 July 2005 is/are: a) ☐ Applicant may not request that any objection to the or	vn from consideration.  relection requirement.  r.  ☑ accepted or b) ☐ objected to bedrawing(s) be held in abeyance. See	e 37 CFR 1.85(a).			
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).					
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.					
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119  12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  a) All b) Some * c) None of:  1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No  3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).  * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.					
Attachment(s)  1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 7/05.	4)  Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5)  Notice of Informal P 6)  Other:	ite			

Application/Control Number: 10/543,127 Page 2

Art Unit: 1797

#### **DETAILED ACTION**

### Claim Objections

1. Claim 1 is objected to because of the following informalities: there is a typographical error on line 9; it appears that filtrations should read filtration. Appropriate correction is required.

#### Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102 and 103

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

- (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 2. <u>Claims 1-7, 11 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Glos II US 3 369 668.</u>

Claim 1, Glos teaches a filter sector (12) comprising: a first filtration wall (28) of a substantially rigid net, and a second filtration wall (28) of a substantially rigid net

Art Unit: 1797

opposite the first filtration wall, a filtrate chamber (18c) being formed between the first and second filtration walls, wherein the filtration walls are profiled to form a multiplicity of cavities and humps and that each cavity and hump respectively includes a multiplicity of meshes of the net (fig. 4-7).

Claims 2-7, 11 and 12, Glos further teaches the cavities and humps respectively are oriented in rows with the rows of cavities alternating with the rows of humps (fig. 4-7); the cavities and humps are formed by weaving the net (fig. 7); the cavities and humps are formed by pressing (col. 3, lines 59-65); each cavity and hump is defined by four straight sides (fig. 7); each straight side of a cavity is common to one of the four straight sides of an adjacent hump (fig. 7); and the first and second filtration walls of the new take the shape of a bag (fig. 4, 5).

# 3. <u>Claims 8 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable</u> over Glos '668 in view of Oliver et al. US 2 964 194 and Jackson US 3 948 779.

Claim 8, Glos further teaches first and second support walls (34, 36) made of a planar perforated material that is coarser that the net of the filtration walls, wherein the first and second support walls support the first and second filtration walls respectively (fig. 4, 5). Glos does not teach what material the support wall is made of. Oliver and Jackson both teach a support wall made of metal net (Jackson, col. 2, line 61 - col. 3, line 11; Oliver, col. 1, lines 22-25). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use metal for the support

Application/Control Number: 10/543,127 Page 4

Art Unit: 1797

material because the material allows the support to be self supporting, support the filter material and allow passage of filtrate therethrough (Jackson, col. 3, lines 1-11). Also, use of a metal support is very well known in the art and would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art because the particular technique is recognized as part of the ordinary capabilities of one skill in the art, KSR International Co. v. Teleflex Inc., 82 USPQ2d 1385 (2007).

Claim 9, Glos further teaches the support walls are joined to each other at the radial sides of the filter sector, whereby the filtration walls and support walls form a bag like filter unit (fig. 4, 5).

# 4. <u>Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Glos</u> '668 in view of Mohlin et al. US 6 231 761 and Vore US 3 331 512.

Glos teaches the filter sector of claim 1 but does not teach the net comprises a metal net. Mohlin and Vore both teach the use of a filtration wall comprising a metal net (Mohlin, col. 1, lines 48-59; Vore, col. 1, lines 43-45). The use of metal net for a filtration wall is very well known in the prior art as demonstrated by Mohlin and Vore. Therefore using a metal net would have been obvious because the particular known technique was recognized as part of the ordinary capabilities of one skill in the art, KSR International Co. v. Teleflex Inc., 82 USPQ2d 1385 (2007).

#### Conclusion

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to BENJAMIN KURTZ whose telephone number is (571)272-8211. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday 8:00am to 4:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David Sample can be reached on 571-272-1376. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Benjamin Kurtz Examiner Art Unit 1797

/Benjamin Kurtz/ Examiner, Art Unit 1797 9/11/08

/Krishnan S Menon/ Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1797